

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 6 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 – 6 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claims 1 – 6 are amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 6 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1 and 3

Claims 1 – 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pollock et al.* (“*Pollock*”) (GB 2275654) in view of *Ando* (JP 2003076967). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a polarization beam splitter.

In relevant part, Claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

“... a rectifying unit for rectifying an electromagnetic wave sent from the data processor;

an electric double-layer capacitor for storing a rectified power supplied from the rectifying unit;

a controlling unit for controlling the information exchange with the data processor and the display of information received from the data processor;

a displaying unit having a storing function to hold the display even after power supply is stopped and which displays the information under the control of the controlling unit, and

an information selecting unit physically operable by a user for selecting information to be displayed on the displaying unit from the information stored in a storage unit...”

This is clearly unlike *Pollock* and *Ando*, taken singly or in combination with each other. The Examiner states that *Pollock* teaches a smart card having a display, an interface unit and an energy source, and that *Ando* teaches a non-contact IC card having an electric double layer capacitor to store power from the electromagnetic waves from a host system.

However, Applicant submits that both *Pollock* and *Ando* fail to teach or suggest an information selecting unit physically operable by a user for selecting information to be displayed

on the displaying unit from the information stored in a storage unit. As such, *Pollock* and *Ando* may not properly be combined to reject Claim 1.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over *Pollock* in view of *Ando*, as are dependent Claims 2 – 6, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 - 6 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 17, 2008

By: /Kader Gacem/

Kader Gacem
Registration No. 52,474
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000